



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/611,474	07/07/2000	Paul A. Smethers	UWP1P033/1135 6947		
22434	7590 08/25/2004		EXAMINER		
BEYER W	EAVER & THOMAS LL	ORGAD, EDAN			
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			ART UNIT PAPER NUM		
BERREDELY, C.L. 7.70. 0.70			2684		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)			
_		09/611,4	11,474 SMETHERS, PAUL A.				
Of	fice Action Summary	Examine	Г	Art Unit			
		Edan O	<u> </u>	2684			
<i> The ا</i> Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communic ly	cation appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE MAILIN  - Extensions of after SIX (6) N  - If the period fo  - If NO period fo  - Failure to reply Any reply rece	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FO NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO time may be available under the provisions of ONTHS from the mailing date of this common or reply specified above is less than thirty (30 or reply is specified above, the maximum state by within the set or extended period for reply we divided by the Office later than three months after term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evalunication. of days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap	vent, however, may a reply be tin tutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicati (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.		
Status							
1) Respo	onsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>14 June 2004.</i>					
·		b) This action is	non-final.				
3) Since	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of	Claims						
4a) Of 5)⊠ Claim 6)⊠ Claim 7)□ Claim 8)□ Claim	(s) <u>1,3-20,22-27 and 29-31</u> is/a the above claim(s) is/ar (s) <u>5-7,10-19,24 and 25</u> is/are a (s) <u>1,3,4, 8,9,20,22,23,26,27,29</u> (s) is/are objected to. (s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from coallowed. 9-31 is/are rejected.	onsideration.				
Application Pa							
<u> </u>	pecification is objected to by the			_			
	rawing(s) filed on is/are:		•				
	ant may not request that any objec cement drawing sheet(s) including			· •	(4)		
_	ath or declaration is objected to				(a).		
Priority under :	35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknow a) All 1. 2. 3.	wledgment is made of a claim f	documents have been documents have been of the priority documnal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receiv le 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)							
	erences Cited (PTO-892) ftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	ΓO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) 🔲 Information D	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F			Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2684

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3,4, 9, 20, 23, 27,29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kudoh (US 3 6,008,738).

Regarding claims 1, 20, 27 and 31, Kudoh teaches a method for processing an overloaded key (element 18) on a mobile device (radio pager is a mobile device by definition), said method comprising: receiving a key press of the overloaded key to be processed from a buffer; determining whether the function of the overloaded key has switched; and clearing any subsequent overloaded key presses of the overloaded key from the buffer when said determining determines that the function of the overloaded key has switched (col. 2, lines 58-67 & col. 3, lines 1-23) and setting a pause period for the overloaded key when said determining determines that the function of the overloaded key has switched so that subsequent presses of the overloaded key are ignored during the pause period (col. 3, lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 3, 22 and 29, Kudoh teaches determining whether the overload key press occurred during the pause period; and processing the overloaded key press when said determining determines that the function of the overloaded key has not

Art Unit: 2684

switched and said determining determines that the overloaded key press did not occur during the pause period (col. 3, lines 123).

Regarding claim 4, Kudoh teaches determining whether the function of the overload key has switched comprises determining whether the function of the overloaded key has transitioned from a first function to a second function since its last key press (col. 2, lines 58-67).

Regarding claims 9 and 23, Kudoh teaches the mobile device is a two-way mobile communication device having limited input keys, one of the input keys being the overloaded key (fig. 1 & col. 1, lines 47-67).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudoh (US 3 6,008,738).

Regarding claims 8, 26 and 30, Kudoh teaches a mobile pager but fails to specifically disclose the mobile device is a personal digital assistant or a cellular phone. However, official notice is taken that it is very well known in the art mobile devices to have a personal digital assistant or a cellular phone that is a pager as well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2684

made to have Kudoh's mobile pager be a part of a personal digital assistant or a cellular phone in order to further enhance user's needs such as cellular calls, emails etc.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7, 10-19, 24 and 25 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claims 5-7, 10-19, 24 and 25, see reasons for allowance in office action # 6,

dated 3/12/04.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/14/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's arguments in view of amended claims 1, 20, 27 and 31, applicant has amended the claims above to include the limitations of cancelled claims 2, 21 and 28. Applicant argues that Kudoh (US 6,008,738) fails to disclose setting a pause period for the overloaded key when said determining determines that the function of the overloaded key has switched so that subsequent presses of the overloaded key are ignored

Art Unit: 2684

during the pause period. More specifically, applicant suggests that Kudoh cannot be said to ignore key presses during the pause period. However, it is examiner's contention that Kudoh does disclose ignoring any key presses during the pause period and this is evident in Kudoh col. 51-67 & col. 4, lines 6-16, Kudoh teaches that during the standby state (i.e., pause period) if the overloaded/multi-function is pressed during a timeout period it acts in the same manner it was intended to be used prior to the timeout or pause period. Therefore, if the overloaded/multi-function key is pressed during the pause period, all of its other functions are ignored.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2684

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edan Orgad whose telephone number is 703-305-4223. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 703-305-4223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edan Orgad

August 18, 2004

QUOCHIEN B. VUONG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Sunthen In Thing 8/23/04